

FILEDJUN 20 2008
*[Signature]*CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

1 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)
 2 United States Attorney

3 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)
 4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 ROBERT N. MICHAELS (PABN 200918)
 6 Special Assistant United States Attorney

7 Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law
 8 1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
 Monterey, CA 93944
 Telephone: (831) 242-4537
 FAX: (831) 242-5198

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 12 SALINAS DIVISION

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Criminal No.: CR-08-00257 PVT
14 Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] <i>rg</i>
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
15 vs.)	
16 TORY G. CARPENTER,)	
17 Defendant.)	

18 On June 2, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status hearing. The
 19 parties jointly requested that the case be continued from June 2, 2008, until August 4, 2008 at
 20 9:30 a.m., in order to allow time for defendant's counsel to prepare for the case. In addition, the
 21 parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from June 2, 2008 to August
 22 4, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate
 23 based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

1 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

4 DATED: 5 June 2008

/S/
ROBERT N. MICHAELS
Special Assistant United States Attorney

7 DATED:

/S/
NICK HUMY
Counsel for SANTILLAN

10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from June 2, 2008 to August 4, 2008. The Court finds, based on the
13 aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested continuance
14 and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to
15 grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for
16 effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
17 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: 6/20/08



RICHARD SEEBORG
United States Magistrate Judge